Review Process

DPI staff and outside reviewers will rate each of the grant applications using the following rubric. Following the review, the DPI will communicate the results to the grant contact person or the grant coordinator identified in the application. If there are issues or concerns for grants that are awarded, these will need to be addressed by applicants before the DPI awards the grant.

2014-15 Peer Review and Mentoring Grant Evaluation Rubric

Following is the rubric that will be used to evaluate grant proposals. The rubric is included here to serve as a proposal development guide for applicants. Scoring will be rated as strong (S), average (A) or weak (W). Each proposal will be read and rated by a team consisting of DPI staff and external stakeholders.

	Strong (S)	Average (A)	Weak (W)	Finding
Grant Requirements				
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: Describe how the proposed program will support the implementation of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System.	Clear and succinct description of need, including how the program will impact student growth.	General description of need.	Description of need unclear or beyond the scope of the grant.	
	Comprehensive data analysis and other relevant information support the identified need, targeting high-need student populations that will be served.	Some relevant local data/information cited.	Weak data/background information.	
	Plan states how student learning will improve and how differentiated support for educators will take place.	Plan references how it will improve student learning and differentiated support for educators but no detail is provided.	Plan provides little or no connection to improved student learning and no differentiated support is indicated.	
	Program description includes a clear plan for supporting the EEP process, and specifically targets student outcomes.	There is mention of EEP support, but it is not targeted toward student outcomes.	Support for the EEP process is not included in the plan.	

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION CON'T.	Program description includes a clear plan for job-embedded professional development to support effectiveness coaches.	Job-embedded professional development is mentioned, but implementation is unclear.	Job-embedded professional development is not included in the plan.	
	Goals are stated, clearly, and make direct connection to professional growth and improved student learning.	Goals described generally with some connection to professional growth and improved student learning.	Goals provide a limited connection to professional growth and improved student learning.	
	Objectives/Activities are listed and include a well-developed timeline and activities that are strategically connected to overall program goals.	Objectives are listed but are not part of a well-developed timeline, or are not strategically connected to the overall program goals.	Goal objectives and activities are not listed or are vaguely connected.	
	An evaluation plan is included, specific, based on comprehensive analysis of data, and is directly related to educator professional growth and impact on student learning.	A general evaluation plan is included, uses some data and references connection to professional growth, and measures impact on student learning.	Evaluation plan is not data-based, and does not link directly to professional growth and impact on student learning.	
	Program description includes a clear and specific description of how collaboration within the consortium will take place and its connection to improved student learning throughout the consortium.	General description of how collaboration within the consortium will take place and its connection to improved student learning throughout the consortium.	Description of how collaboration within the consortium will take place and its connection to improved student learning is unclear or non-existent.	
	The proposal describes a clear plan to continue the program beyond the one-year grant period. Resources to continue the program are addressed.	The proposal describes in general terms how the program will continue beyond the one-year	No description or a vague description is provided for continuing the plan beyond the one-year grant period.	

		grant period.		
ALLOCATION OF MATCHING FUNDS: Describe the plan for allocating local matching funds of at least 20 percent.	The proposal provides clear details and rationale for the consortium's 20 percent local matching funds.	The proposal gives a general description of how matching funds may be allocated.	The proposal fails to include a description of the required local matching funds.	
DESCRIPTION OF COACH ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: Describe the selection, training, roles and responsibilities of the coaches.	The roles and responsibilities of the Effectiveness coach are well-developed (for example: including a position description). Program alignment to EE and training for the coach role clear.	The roles and responsibilities of the Effectiveness coach are not fully developed or aligned well to EE or the grant program.	The roles and responsibilities of the coach minimal or non-existent. Those mentioned do not clearly align to the applicant's need or overall grant program.	

For Office use only:

Priorities:

Is the applicant a CESA? Yes □   No □

Does the budget align with the proposal's goal(s), objectives, activities and allotted grant funds for the activities? Yes □ No □

Does the application clearly address program sustainability and/or growth? Yes □   No □